

274
LETTER

TO A

BISHOP

CONCERNING THE

DIVINE LEGATION

Warburton (W.)

OF

M O S E S.

L O N D O N.

Printed for E. WITHERS, at the Seven-
Stars, in Fleet-street.

(Price One Shilling)



LONDON:

Printed by E. Williams, in the Strand, near the Temple.

(Price One Shilling)

A

LETTER to a BISHOP, &c.

My Lord,

IT is now *some Time* since the Rev. Dr. Warburton obliged the World with his *divine Legation of Moses*, which he proposes to *demonstrate from the Omission of a future State of Rewards and Punishments in the Mosaic Dispensation*. — How far he has succeeded, must be left to your Lordship's Determination: But it is a Proposition that gives Offence to many sober Men, as it places the whole Body of the *Jewish People* in a Light derogatory to human Nature, making them to live and die like Swine; for without the Knowledge of a future State, they could be

B

no

no better than Brutes. Nay it supposes them of all Men the most brutish, since, according to him, all the World but themselves, had the Doctrine of a future State incorporated into their Laws, and made it the Motive of their Actions. What a miserable Condition is this for the chosen People of God to be in, and permitted to continue in by God himself, while under his immediate and extraordinary Government.

This, my Lord, is, as I take it, a *new* Medium, a *novel* Opinion, and of which the Church of *England* in her Articles and Homilies, has openly declared her Abhorrence : And yet I do not find, that this Author has met with the Discountenance of any of the Governors of *that* Church whose Articles he so daringly opposes. It doth not become me to call in Question the Conduct of my Superiors, but I hope, it may be permitted me, without giving Offence, to lay my Thoughts of this Gentleman's Medium before your Lordship ; and humbly to request that you will vouchsafe out of your fatherly Goodness, to let me know *whether the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments is*

to be found in, or did make Part of the *Mosaic Dispensation*.

Dr. Warburton does not, I think, decide whether the Omission of a future State proceeded from Ignorance or Design in *Moses*; but by the Use of the Term *Omission*, and his Reasoning in many Places upon the Expediency of such *Omission*, he seems to insinuate that the *Jewish* Legislator was himself well acquainted with this Doctrine, tho' he thought not proper to give it a Place in his Laws. Give me Leave to ask your Lordship, by what Means *Moses* could arrive at this Knowledge, which will not equally conclude that the whole Body of the People might be likewise informed of it? Did he receive it by special Revelation from God? If so, was not his Legation from the same God of Truth? And can it be supposed that this all-gracious Being would reveal a future State to *Moses* upon calling him to deliver his chosen People, and at the same Time give him in Command to omit it in his *Dispensation*? A Dispensation that had God for its immediate Author, and which was to bring them to *Christ*, with whom the Knowledge of a future State is

inseparably annexed ? If *Moses* had the Knowledge of a future State by Tradition from his Parents, then the Body of the People might have it the same Way : And Dr. *Warburton* should previously have proved that the Knowledge of this Doctrine was not current among the *Israelites*, before *Moses's* Time. For if it appears, as I think it will upon laying Things together, that the People must have had this Doctrine before *Moses* wrote, *Moses* could not impose it upon them, as the Doctor would upon us, that *the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, is not to be found in, nor did make Part of the Mosaic Dispensation.*

When the Children of *Israel* were Slaves in *Egypt*, the People to the lowest feared God, and knew the *Lord*. Upon what Account ? and in what Respect did this Fear arise ? Temporal Rewards and Punishments, and an equal Providence could not be the Motive. Neither could they regard God as civil Governor. They were given up into the Hands of those who cruelly and despitefully treated them, who denied the *Lord* and served other Gods. “ Who is the *Lord*,” (said *Pharaoh*)
“ that

“ that I should obey his Voice to let *Israel* go;
 “ I know not the *Lord*, neither will I let
 “ *Israel* go.” And this they suffered for
 their Obedience to the *Lord*, and their re-
 fusing to apostatize and worship the *Gods* of
 the *Egyptians*. In their then unhappy Cir-
 cumstances, destitute, afflicted, tormented, if
 in this Life only they had Hope in God, they
 were of all Men most miserable! Could Ig-
 norance of a future State of Rewards and
 Punishments, and a Belief that they should be
 as if they had never been, induce them, and
 their Deliverer *Moses* to prefer the Reproach
 of *Christ* before the Riches of *Egypt*, and
 keep them so stedfast and immoveable in the
Lord? What was it to them what *God* they
 served, unless they looked for a future Re-
 ward in a future State? Nay, it had been
 better to have served the *Gods* of the *Egypt-*
tians; they would, then, have had Plenty
 and Ease, which according to Dr. *Warbur-*
ton’s Scheme, was all they served God for,
 or the only Motive that could prevail upon
 their carnal Hearts to serve any God. The
 Hopes of temporal Deliverance could have no
 Weight with them; they entertained no
 Hopes

Hopes of any such Thing. For when *Moses*, by God's Appointment, visited them, they understood not how that God by his Hand would deliver them. And, after they were brought out of Bondage, upon every Rub in their Way, they were for turning back into *Egypt*.

I know not what it may do to your Lordship, but to me, the Epistle to the *Hebrews* speaks plain enough, when it says, that “ *Moses* esteemed the Reproach of *Christ* “ greater Riches than the Treasures of *Egypt*, “ for he had Respect unto the Recompence “ of Reward,” I say to me, it seems plain, that the Hopes of an happy Immortality in a future State through the Merits of *Christ*, was the Inducement to suffer the Reproach of *Christ*. It is also evident that the whole Body of the People endured the same Reproach upon the same Account. For ver. 25, says, that he suffered Affliction in common with the People of God, and ver. 26, explains this *Affliction* by calling it the *Reproach of Christ*: Whence it follows, that the Affliction the People of God suffered, was the Reproach of *Christ*, and that upon Account of the Recompence of Reward.

Put

Put this together (my Lord) and then, since the Knowledge of *Christ* and of a future State are inseparably annexed, the Consequence is direct, as the Homily on Faith expresses it, that “ although they were not named Christian Men, yet was it a Christian Faith that they had ; for they looked for all the Benefits of God the Father, through the Merits of his Son *Jesus Christ*, as we do now, and in effect *they and we be all one.*” So they could not be ignorant of a future State, neither could *Moses* omit it in his Dispensation.

The Case of *Abraham* offering up *Isaac*, which Dr. *Warburton* makes a Revelation concerning the Redemption of Mankind by *Christ*, is a great and noble Instance, that the *Jews* under the Law neither were, nor could be unacquainted with its spiritual Meaning, so with the Doctrine of a future State ; because their typical Institutions gave as strong Intimations of the Redemption of Mankind by *Christ*, and were as illustrious Representations of the Sacrifice of *Christ*, as the commanded Sacrifice of *Isaac*. This will appear plain enough from his own State of the Case.

He says *, that “ the typical Representa-
 “ tions of the great Sacrifice for the Sins of
 “ Mankind, by the commanded Sacrifice of
 “ *Isaac*, was given in the *strong* and *forcible*
 “ Way of Action, that nothing can be con-
 “ ceived more apposite to convey the Infor-
 “ mation than this *very Action*, and that
 “ God instructed *Abraham* by this symboli-
 “ cal Act, or typical Representation, in the
 “ best Manner Humanity is capable of re-
 “ ceiving Instruction.” How consistent
 this Instance of the Clearness and Perspicuity
 of Types is, with what he elsewhere says †,
 “ that a typical Representation necessarily
 “ implies the throwing a Thing into Shade,
 “ and secreting it from vulgar Knowledge,”
 I leave your Lordship to judge; and to admire
 the Modesty of the Man, who could hope his
 Readers, especially those of the Clergy, would
 overlook or pardon, for the Sake of his Me-
 dium, such a glaring Contradiction. What
 he brings by Way of Salvo, “ that the Nar-
 “ rative of such a Converse by Action, is not
 “ in its Nature so intelligible or obvious,
 “ where the Information is for the Sake of
 “ the

* D. L. vol. II. part II. p. 607.

† Ibid. p. 430.

"the Actor only," makes strongly against him. The Action is allowed to be obvious and intelligible, which is enough to prove that the *Mosaic* Dispensation, which was nothing else but a more minute scenical Representation by Actions of what the commanded Sacrifice of *Isaac*, and the permitted one of the Ram typified, was understood by the People in its spiritual Sense; because they were the Spectators of all, the Actors in many of the Ceremonies. And why Sacrifice under the Law should speak a Language to the *Jews* different from what it spoke to their Father *Abraham*, or why it was not intended for the sake of Information, of which it was so proper and logical a Mode, will require another Volume to prove. The Obscurity, then, will be on the Side of the Relation, not on the Action of the typical Rites and Ceremonies in the *Mosaic* Dispensation, and the Body of the People upon this Supposition would be better able to see through the Types, when performed, than we who have only the Relation. But then, my Lord, this is diametrically opposite to the Doctor's grand Demonstration; unless Representation by Action, the best Manner Humanity is capable of receiving

Instruction, was given to the *Jews* by the *Mosaic* Dispensation, as the best Manner to keep them from receiving Instruction. This is indeed *powdering with Paradoxes*, and must give a notable Relish to his System.

Since Actions then spoke as intelligibly as Words, since representative Actions were so common a Mode of Information, and so well understood at the Time of giving the *Mosaic* Dispensation, as the Doctor has taken up some Pages to prove. The Emblematical Rites, Ceremonies, and Institutions of that Dispensation must speak a Language plain enough not to be mistaken by the Body of the People ; as talking in the Standard Phraseology of the Times. And if the Patriarch *Abraham*, the Father of the Faithful, saw so clearly the Redemption of Mankind by the Sacrifice of *Christ*, in the Command to offer up his Son *Isaac* ; how can his Children be supposed so grossly blind, as not to have the least Glimpse of that interesting Affair in their daily Sacrifices ? Did God, who favoured *Abraham* with this special Revelation of the Mystery of the Redemption, enjoin him Secrecy ? Or can it be imagined that he, who rejoiced so much to see

see *Christ's* Day, would hide that momentous Affair from his Posterity? *That*, in which, not only they, but all the Nations of the Earth were to be blessed? Especially, when we consider that the Promise of *Christ* was made to him, because God knew he would command *his Children and Household* after him to keep the *Way of the Lord*. Was not the *Redemption of Mankind* by *Christ*, the *Way of the Lord*? Were not the *Jews* his *Children and Household*? And could they be said to keep this *Way* after him, and yet know nothing of it, so soon after as *Moses's* Time?

If the commanded Sacrifice of *Isaac* was so very exact an *Image* in all its Particulars, of the final antitypical Sacrifice of *Christ*, and the permitted one of the Ram offered up instead of *Isaac*, was the *Shadow* of the intermediate typical Sacrifice in the *Mosaic* Oeconomy, (as this Gentleman, unluckily enough for his Medium, proves.) Could the *Jews*, then, my Lord, be ignorant at what the *Mosaic* Oeconomy aimed, or not know the Law to be the *Shadow* of the good Things to come? Could *this* Action be so strong, forcible, and opposite a Way of Information to *Abraham*,

and the very same Action in the Law be so very *feint*, *weak* and *unintelligible* an one to his Seed? And would God, who chose this Way as the fittest to reveal his Will to *Abraham*, incorporate the same Method of Instruction into his Law in order to secrete the Knowledge of his Will from his Children? Or how could the Son of God upbraid the *Jews* of his Time with the Faith of *Abraham* in this very Action, if the legal Sacrifices and Types were designedly so obscure, and intended to be so by his Father, as that they could not, nor were not to be seen thorough by Faith?

As then Sacrifice was so exact a Delineation of the great Oblation for the Sins of the World: As God made Choice of it as the best Manner of manifesting *Christ* to *Abraham*, and as Sacrificature was the highest Act of religious Service in the *Mosaic* Dispensation; who can doubt but that the *Jews*, as well as their Father *Abraham*, saw *Christ's* Day thorough this Glass, and were glad. And then they must know, not only that a future State of Rewards and Punishments was in, and made Part of their Institutions, but must observe

observe the whole Law upon that Motive, because, as Dr. Warburton owns, “ a future
 “ State and Redemption by *Christ* are insepa-
 “ rably annexed, and knowing and acting
 “ upon the one, is knowing and acting upon
 “ the other *.

The Doctor does not inform his Readers, though it is an interesting Point, what were the Sentiments of *Abraham* upon Sacrifice before the Command to offer up his Son; for it is plain from Scripture, that he had been used to Sacrifice; nay, the Command to offer up *Isaac* for a Burnt Offering, and the Questions *Isaac* asked about it, shew that neither of them were Strangers to the Act of Sacrifice †. What Language, let me ask, did Sacrifice speak to him before this Command? If it spoke an unintelligible one, my Lord, how came he so readily to understand the Language of the commanded Sacrifice of *Isaac*, and of the permitted one of the Ram? How came he at all acquainted with the Mystery of the Redemption by the Sacrifice of *Christ*, as to desire so earnestly to be let in to it, if he had no previous Knowledge of Sacrifice,

sacrifice, and what it signified? *Abraham*
 either previously knew the Mystery of the
 Redemption by the Sacrifice of *Christ*, and
 that Sacrifice prefigured it; or he did not;
 if he did not know it, how could he be so
 desirous of being let into a Mystery of which
 he was totally ignorant? Or how could Sacri-
 fice, of which he knew not the Meaning, let
 him into the Secret of *Christ's* Day? If he
 knew the Meaning of Sacrifice before the
 Command to offer up his Son; then, in every
 Sacrifice he saw *Christ's* Day, and was glad
 whenever he sacrificed. I think, my Lord;
 that *Abraham* must be supposed to know the
 Mystery of Redemption by *Christ* before this
 Command, or else it could never have entered
 into his Head to desire to see *Christ's* Day:
 And he must likewise, be supposed to know
 what Sacrifice prefigured; or else he would
 not so readily have taken its Meaning in the
 commanded Sacrifice of *Isaac*, and the per-
 mitted one of the Ram. The Epistle to the
Hebrews, says, that "by *Faith*, *Abraham*
 when he was tried, offered up *Isaac*." Must
 not this be *Faith in Christ*, my Lord? But
 then if he offered him up by *Faith*, he must
 have this *Faith* before the Command. And
 how

how he came by this Faith, and the Knowledge of the Redemption by *Christ*, remains to be shewn by Dr. *Warburton*; as also it is incumbent upon him to offer some Reason, why the Body of the People of the *Jews* might not arrive at the same Knowledge by the same Means by which their Father *Abraham* acquired his. If you suppose *Abraham* to have been unacquainted with the Mystery of the Redemption by *Christ*, and never to have known or suspected any thing of it, or never to have offered any Sacrifice before; can you think, my Lord, that the Command to offer up his Son would so instantaneously and so clearly have let him into that Mystery? Give me Leave to ask your Lordship, whether Dr. *Warburton's* State of the Case of *Abraham*, doth not contradict the Scripture Account. We read *Gen. xxii. 1.* " And it
 " came to pass after these Things that God
 " did TEMPT *Abraham*," and in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, that " by Faith *Abraham* when he was TRYED, offered up
 " *Isaac*." But what TEMPTATION or what TRIAL could there be, if *Abraham*, certainly aforehand knew, that the whole was only to be a Piece of Scenery, to inform him by
 Actions

Actions instead of Words, that *Christ* was to be
 the great Sacrifice for the Sins of the World.
 There was, in this Case, no Room for that Strug-
 gle, which the Epistle to the *Hebrews* makes
 him to have within himself, if he previously
 knew how the scenical Representation was to
 end, “ and that God would either stop his
 “ Hand, when he came to give the sacrificing
 “ Stroke, or that his Son, if sacrificed, was *im-*
 “ *mediately* to be restored to Life.” The Patri-
 arch, indeed, accounted “ that God was *able* to
 “ raise him up, even from the Dead ;” but it
 is no where said or intimated, that he *pre-*
viously knew that God would *immediately* re-
 store him to Life, if sacrificed. And hence
 arose the Struggle in his Breast how to recon-
 cile the Command to sacrifice his Son with
 the Promise, that in this very Son *Isaac* his
Said should be called, and how to conquer his
 natural Affection, and bring it into Captivity
 to the Obedience of the Command. Dr.
Warburton indeed, asserts “ that the *princi-*
 “ *pal* Design of the Command was to reveal
 “ to *Abraham* by Actions instead of Words,
 “ the Redemption of Mankind,” and proves
 it after his usual Manner ; “ for it is not said
 “ that God gave this Command in order to
 “ try

“ try *Abraham*, but that in giving the Com-
 “ mand God *did try him*.” Such kind of
 Reasoning, in his former Profession, would
 have been called a *Law-Quibble*; and
 is much the same as if after Sentence of
 Death passed upon a Convict, he should be
 told *that the Judge did not pass Sentence upon*
him in order to condemn him, but that in pass-
ing the Sentence the Judge did condemn him.
 I dare say, your Lordship, as a Scholar, dis-
 dains such mean Sophistry, and as a Christian,
 abhors such deceitful Handling of the Word
 of God. And I appeal to your Lordship,
 whether upon Dr. *Warburton's* Supposition,
Abraham can be said to be either *tempted* or
tried: And yet the Scripture says, that the
 Command to offer up *Isaac*, was for a Trial
 of *Abraham's* Faith, πιστις πειρασμοῦ Ἀβραάμ οὗ Ἰσαὰκ
προσφορῆς, “ by Faith *Abraham* offered up
 “ *Isaac being tried*.” Then, my Lord, the
 offering up *Isaac* was the *Trial and Test* of
 his Faith, “ Here was an only Child, the
 “ Son of his Love, of his Hopes, and the
 “ Heir of the Promises demanded, and
 “ readily given up. The End was worthy for
 “ which he should do it. It was to partake
 “ of the Benefits of the Death of the Son of
 D God;

“ God; and by it he gave not only as to him-
 “ self the most valuable, but to every Body
 “ the exactest Figure of the Sacrifice of the
 “ Son of God.

“ When we view the Sacrifice of *Isaac* in
 “ this Light, all Difficulties vanish; why
 “ was he demanded as a *burnt Sacrifice*, and
 “ the Father ordered to offer up his beloved
 “ Son? The Father stood in God's stead,
 “ and gave up his Son *instead* of the Son of
 “ God; as a Proof of his own Faith,
 “ and a Lesson of Instruction to the Un-
 “ believers of that Time, and a standing
 “ Evidence to that, and all future Gene-
 “ rations; that not a *Lamb*, but a *Man*, and
 “ that not *Isaac*, but a Seed that was to de-
 “ scend from him, was to bear the Wrath of
 “ God for all Men. Why is the Scripture
 “ silent as to the *Design* with which *Abra-*
 “ *ham* offered up his Son? Because *Sacrifices*
 “ *were the Type, the well-known Type, and*
 “ *had no other View and Intention.* Does
 “ *Abraham* express no Surprise at this *hard*
 “ *Trial*, nor expostulate with God upon it?
 “ He knew the Son of God was to be given
 “ for him, and should he refuse his Son to
 “ God?” I borrow this Paragraph from one
 of

of Dr. Warburton's Opponents, the learned and judicious Mr. *Julius Bate*, to whom the Doctor has thought proper to return no Answer, unless Scurrility and Reviling, are to be deemed an Answer: And, surely Mr. *Bate's* Objections must have galled Dr. *Warburton* sore, when they could make his *meek* and *Christian* Spirit forget that excellent Advice of our Church Catechism, *to keep one's Tongue from evil Speaking, Lying, and Slandering.*

“ But the *Jews*, (says the Doctor) were
 “ a *carnal* People, incapable of spiritual
 “ Things.” Before he had brought or allowed this Objection, he should have shewn Cause, why they were more carnal, or less capable of Spirituals than their Ancestor *Abraham*? By what Means did the Descendants fall so short of their Progenitor, and become so carnal and grossly-minded? They might methinks, have learned in *Egypt* to decypher a Type; a Nation that recorded every thing by Hieroglyphicks and Symbols. Why should they be more carnal than the rest of Mankind? Or why would God pick out the most stupid of his Creatures, with whom to deposite his *lively Oracles*? In what Sense were they

lively Oracles, if they did not *teach* Life? The Law, my Lord, could not *give* Life, but it could and did *teach* Life, by pointing out and prefiguring *Christ*, who is the *Way*, the *Resurrection*, and the *Life*. And this is Dr. *Warburton*'s stumbling Block, in not distinguishing between *teaching*, and *giving* Life; and he is continually placing it in the Way of his Readers, by bringing Texts which say the Law could not *give* Life, to prove that it could not *teach* Life. Another Artifice which he makes Use of to give a Colour to his Hypothesis, and to gloss over his false Reasoning, is to jumble together the Texts of the New Testament, that speak of the Law, without considering the different Views in which the Writers represent it. When they oppose it to *Christ*, the Reality, they call it a *dead Letter*, a *carnal Commandment*, the *Ministration of Death*, and so forth. And such it was of itself, or *carnally* taken; but taken *spiritually* it was the very Gospel: *Ipssimum Evangelium* says the great Bishop *Bull*, whom Dr. *Warburton* would press into his Service; with how much Violence and Injustice is well known to your Lordship.

St. *Paul* says, " the carnal Mind is at Enmity against God, for it is not subject to the Law of God, neither indeed can it be." Would God make a People, the Keepers of his Law who were at Enmity against him? For so the *Jews* must be, if they were so carnally-minded, as Dr. *Warburton* represents them ; or would God give them a Law that should keep them at Enmity against him? And this the Law must do by the Doctor's Account of it. For if its carnal Cover was designed to keep them in Ignorance of its spiritual Meaning, then were they designedly kept in that State of mental Carnality, which the Apostle says, is at Enmity against God. But how does it appear that the *Jews* were incapable of spiritual Things? Many of them at *Christ's* coming, waited and looked for the Consolation and Redemption of *Israel*. His Disciples trusted that it was *He* who should redeem *Israel*. And when *Christ*, after his Resurrection, expounded unto them, from *Moses* and all the Prophets, the Things concerning *himself*; it is *them* he chargeth with *Folly* and *Slowness* of Heart to believe the Scriptures, and not the Scriptures with-
Ob-

Obscurity and *Omission*; which he should have done, if this Gentleman's Supposition be true. The present Race of *Jews*, indeed, are under a judicial Blindness and Stupidity; but from their first Calling, to their final Rejection, they were so far from being a stupid People, or ever thought so, that even in Captivity, they were looked upon as fittest to be promoted to the highest Posts of Trust and Honour, as appears from many Instances in Scripture, witness *Daniel*, *Shadrach*, *Mesbach*, and *Abednego*, *Mordecai*, &c.

“ But why had the Law a spiritual Sense
 “ under a carnal Cover ?” asks Dr. *War-*
burton ? To whom I answer, because Man is
 a compound Creature, consisting of a spiritual
 Essence under a carnal Cover. Are not the
 Essentials of *Christianity*, *Baptism*, and *the Sup-*
per of the Lord, as much under a carnal Cover
 as the Law ? Was not the Divinity in *Christ*
 under a carnal Cover ? And yet was it not
 expected that Men should see through this
 Cover ? And have not the Faithful in all
 Ages seen through it, and through the out-
 ward and visible Sign received the inward
 and spiritual Grace ? Saying that the Know-
 ledge

ledge of the Types would *indispose* the *Jews* from continuing under the Law, is making Ignorance the Mother of their Devotion; if any Thing can deserve the Name of Devotion, that relates solely to the Things of this World; And he may with as much Reason assert, that seeing through the Symbols of Bread and Wine, will *indispose* Christians from celebrating the Lord's Supper; and that therefore we are to eat and drink them in the Communion without knowing what they mean, until we come into the next World; where all Types are to cease, and Faith is to be swallowed up in Vision. For if it is necessary to shew forth, by Symbols, the Lord's Death, until his second Coming; why was it not equally necessary to prefigure it, until his first Advent? And in what are the Symbols of Bread and Wine, more significant than Sacrificature, and its Rites, and Appendages? The Types have but one Sense, and that is spiritual: The Thing (whatever that be) instituted or appointed, is the *Type, Symbol or Emblem*: The Reason of the Thing, or of the Institution is the Sense. Dr. Warburton allows the Law had a spiritual Sense, but says the *Jews* were incapable of it; which is saying, my Lord, they were incapable of the Law;

Law: For without its Sense, which is granted to be spiritual, *what, or to what End* was the Law? To suppose *its Meaning was not to be understood and known, until Christ came*, is an equal Absurdity with the Supposition above. For in this Case the Law could be of no Use to the People for whose Use it was intended, as a Figure for the *Time then present*, as the Epistle to the *Hebrews* says it was; but it could not be a Figure for the *Time then present*, if the *Time then present* did not know it to be a Figure of the good Things to come, as Dr. *Warburton* asserts; and it could be no Figure of the good Things to come, when the good Things were actually come. For when *Christ* the Reality was come, the Law was to be abolished; and no Evidence or Proof could arise from an Exposition then made, because such Exposition, being *ex post facto*, could be no Proof. But if the Law was given to the *Jews* to point out *Christ*, then we see in what Manner, and of whom it prophecyed until *John*. They had then infallible Marks to know the *Messiah* when he came; and there arises from the exact and minute fulfilling of every *Yot* and *Tittle* of the Law, a Demonstration, that proves the Divinity of both *Moses* and *Jesus*, his Legation,

tion, as natural and easy, as it is just and conclusive. Whereas, Dr. *Warburton's* Glosses, like the Traditions of the Pharisees, make the Law of God of no Effect, and the End of promulging it lost.

The legal Sacrifices and ritual Performances were not required by God for his own Sake, or for any real Value in themselves. "Wherefore then serveth the Law? It was added, because of Transgressions till the Seed should come to whom the Promise was made." As a *Memorial*, as a *Record* of the original Revelation, and as a *Rectification* of the Abuses that had crept in between the first Publication of the Terms of Mercy through the promised Seed and *Moses* his Time. And it was instituted in *Types*, as the best Manner *Humanity* is capable of receiving Instruction. But, then, it is evident that the *Jews* must know that the Law manifested the *Messiah*; otherwise the End and Design of its Institution was defeated.

But, my Lord, Dr. *Warburton* will allow the Doctrine of a future State to be contained in *Moses* his Writings, if his Readers will be

as carnal as he makes the *Jews*, and allow him, that they did not see it there. For in one Part he says *, “ the pious Ejaculation
 “ of *Jacob*, *I have waited for thy Salvation*,
 “ O Lord, may, for ought I know, in its
 “ literal Meaning respect the Salvation of
 “ *Christ*. But how should an early *Jewish*
 “ Reader understand it in this Sense, when
 “ the same Terms of the Salvation of God
 “ are perpetually employed throughout the
 “ whole Bible, to signify God's temporal
 “ Mercies to the *Jewish* People.” For this
 very Reason, as I apprehend my Lord, a
Jewish Reader might understand it in this
 Sense, because the temporal Mercies or Sal-
 vation of the *Jewish* People were all typical
 of, and upon the Account of the final an-
 titypical Salvation of *Christ*, of which these
 were Pledges and Assurances. And in their
 greatest temporal Distresses and Calamities,
 the Promise of the *Messiah* was made to them
 by Way of Consolation and Support under
 their Afflictions and Sufferings; As to *Noah*
 after the Flood; to *Abraham* on his quitting
 his Country and his Father's House to so-
 journ in a strange Land; to *Abaz* when
 troubled

troubled with the Fear of *Rezen* and *Pekab*, the Kings of *Syria* and of *Israel*, in which the Promise of *Christ* is joined with the temporal Deliverance promised by God. All which plead very strongly for the Knowledge of a future State, being a popular Doctrine among the *Jewish* Nation from the Beginning. For to what Purpose was this done, if the *Jews* be supposed ignorant of a future State? *Christ* was not to be a temporal Deliverer: The Deliverance he wrought was spiritual, from the spiritual Bondage of Death and the Devil, of which the *Egyptian* Slavery under *Pharoah* was the Type. If a private Person, or a Nation were to be now comforted under Calamities, with what *Christ* has done for them, would any Question be made, whether the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments made a Part of their religious Tenets: And can the *Jewish* Nation be supposed to receive the same Consolation from the Faith of what the *Messiah* was to do for them at his Advent, without having the same Creed? And if they had Faith in *Christ*, they must believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments, since, according to Dr. *Warburton*, the Knowledge

of Redémption by *Christ*, and of a future State of Rewards and Punishments are inseparably annexed. How opposite a Method does this Gentleman take from *St. Paul*! This Apostle, in his Apology for Christianity, tells King *Agrippa* *, “ that he said no other “ Things but what the Prophets and *Moses* “ had foretold, that *Christ* should suffer and “ rise from the Dead.” Which he calls “ the Promise to God made unto the Fa- “ thers †,” in Hope and Expectation of whose Completion the whole Body of the *Jews* observed and kept the *Mosaic* Dispensation, as emblematical and predictive of it. What then shall we think of our Doctor, who witnesseth both to *Small* and *Great*, that no such Doctrine is contained in the *Mosaic* Dispensation ?

It is a dangerous Thing, my Lord, to wrest the Scriptures to our own Conceits ; because it is apt to mislead People into a Doubt and Distrust of the Certainty and Truth of the sacred Records : And hence, I am afraid has sprung that extreme Neglect, I had almost said Contempt, with which we see the
Word

* Acts chap. xxvi. ver. 22, 23.

† Ibid. ver. 6, 7.

Word of God treated, both by small and great. Which, if not timely prevented by those whom the Holy Ghost has made Overseers of the Church of *Christ*, will most likely end in some of those Visitations, which the same Scriptures assure us, have always been the consequential Punishment of a national Defection from the Worship of the *holy one of Israel*.

I shall beg Leave, my Lord, to produce a Text or two from the Pentateuch, which to me seem plainly to contain the Doctrine this Gentleman denies to be taught by *Moses*. When the Children of *Israel* had sinned in the Affair of *Korah*, and God declared he would destroy them; *Moses* and *Aaron* thus supplicate the Deity *, “ O God, the God “ of the *Spirits* of all Flesh,” that is, of both the Living and Dead. Now what can any Reader understand by this Expression, but that Man has an immortal Part distinct from the animal Life of the Flesh, which after Death goes into the Hands of God, to be disposed of as it has behaved in this Life. Is not this, my Lord, a parallel Expression to † *Father of Spirits*, in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*? Must it

it

* Numb. xvi. 22.

† Heb. xii. 9.

it not have the same Sense in one Place, as in the other? And is not *Spirit* the Name for the *spiritual immortal* Part of Man? So in *Deuteronomy*, *Moses* commands the *Jews* "to love and serve the Lord with all their Heart, with all their Soul, and with all their Might, and these Words which I command thee this Day shall be in thy Heart," and they are also commanded "to *circumcise* the Foreskin of the Heart." This surely is no carnal Commandment, and is something beyond *external Obedience*. † This is not sticking in the Letter, the *to περιτμη*, the outward Part, the Husk of the Law, but entering into the Spirit which quickeneth, the *to καρτερειν* of the Law. This is being a *Jew* inwardly, and requires a Knowledge and Practice of the spiritual Part of the Law; unless we suppose that God gave them a Commandment they were incapable of obeying; and that to *love the Lord with the Heart*, and to *circumcise the Heart*, imply only a bare outward Observance of a few dead Ceremonies.

The learned and judicious Dr. Hodges Professor of Oriel-College, Oxford, in a Dissertation on

on SHEOL, has proved, as I think, my Lord, that the *Hebrew* Word SHEOL does not signify the Grave, for which KEBER is used; but that it is the *Place of departed Souls* between the Time of *Dissolution*, and the general Resurrection. And, if so, the Doctrine of a future State, or of another State of Existence after the present, could not be unknown to the *Jews*. And if Dr. *Hodges* be right in his Sense of *Sheol* (which is submitted to your Lordship) then these Expressions of Scripture, "*He was gathered to his Father's or People.*" *He slept with his Fathers*, and such like, will be a Proof of a future State; and will be freed from the Exceptions of Dr. *Warburton*; and this Sense of *Sheol* will explain *Jacob's* Speech, when, supposing his Son *Joseph* devoured by wild Beasts, he says, "I will go down to my Son weeping or mourning to *Sheol*," that is, according to Dr. *Hodges's* Interpretation, to the *Repository of departed Souls*.

But further, my Lord, the Deliverance of the People of *Israel* from *Egypt*, the Manner in which that Deliverance was wrought, the Reason and Intent of delivering them, and separating them from the rest of the Nations, with the Sanction of the whole *Mosaic* ritual.

All

(40)
All evince that the *Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments*, was known among the *Jews*, and that their Obedience to the *Mosaic Dispensation* was founded upon it. By *what* was the divine Legation of *Moses demonstrated* to the *Jews*? by teaching them that they should die like the Beasts that perish! By *what* to that powerful Kingdom of heathen Apostates the *Egyptians*; to whom the *Israelites* were Slaves, and from whose Bondage, God by *Moses* delivered them? Was it not by the Miracles that God wrought by the Hands of his Servants *Moses* and *Aaron*, that *Moses* proved his divine Legation? Will not the same Means prove the same to Christians and Deists now? Or is it not a Shame and Disgrace to the Christian Profession, that the Divinity of *Moses* his Legation should need to be demonstrated? Did the Deity (if I may be allowed the Expression) take so much Pains to prove himself *JEHOVAH*, and to record infallibly these Proofs; and are they of no Use at this Time? But we must prove the People of God Brutes and Ideots beyond all the heathen World, in order to shew that *Moses* was sent by God? Was not the Contest in *Egypt*, whether the *Gods of Pharoah* and the

the *Egyptians* were the self-existent, self-powerful Essence, or **JEHOVAH** the God of *Israel* was that Essence. And was it not proved, by a Series of proper Miracles, that **JEHOVAH** the God of *Israel* was the Lord of Hosts, who created the Heavens and the Earth: namely, by controuling the mechanical Powers of the Heavens, which they took for Gods, in the Root and every Branch? To what End did God shew, in Miracles, his Power over this Machine, unless it was to convince Man that he had another Part beside his Body, which was designed for another State, of which he was more immediately God. As *Christ* says to the *Sadducees* "God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living." So I may say to our modern *Sadducees*, who deny a future State in the *Mosaic Dispensation*, *God is not the God of this mortal, but of a future immortal State.* This World must pass away, must die and perish for ever. And if God has shewn himself Master and Lord over Nature, over this State, over this World, which must perish; it is a Proof that there is another State, which remaineth for evermore. For if Man had only a mortal perishable Body, or, which is the same Thing,

if he knew that he had no other Part but this Tabernacle of Clay, to know that this Machine supports it, is enough. It is the God, as I may call it, of the Body; it sustains and gives it Health, Life, and all the Pleasure and Delight that it here enjoys, or can enjoy. If then there is a Revelation of a Being, *totum* *caelo*, different from this Machine, the Heavens, it must imply that Man has a Part, *totum* *caelo*, different from his Body, otherwise the Revelation is of no use. He wants it not for his Body, this material God supplies all its Wants here, and he is supposed to be totally ignorant of any hereafter. And, in Truth, my Lord, "in all Disputes with the Apostles, the main Question was, whether the Host of Heaven, the Airs did every Thing of themselves, or there was an intelligent Being who created and commanded them? The future State and general Judgment, &c. were Consequences which would be believed or disbelieved by that Issue. Job, Moses, David and others, when they were upon the Point of a future State, expressed it as fully as we can do now," as Mr. Bate has clearly proved in his *Consideration of Dr. Warburton's third Proposition*, of

no future State in the Mosaic Dispensation,
and his Remarks upon the Doctor's Remarks,
&c. I may be allowed, I hope, my Lord,
 without giving Offence, to say Mr. Bate has
 clearly proved this Point, until Dr. Warbur-
 ton shews the contrary, which he has not even
 attempted to do, though often and now called
 upon to do it; prudently *despising*, I suppose,
 such Opponents as he cannot *answer*.

If the Air is not God, then there is a Being
 who has created and formed it; and if this
 Being is not in this created System, (as the
 Scriptures assure us he is not) then he is in
 another, so God of another World; and if
 the Contest all along was, whether the Hea-
 vens, the Airs were God, or *Jehovah* was
 God, and Miracles the Determination, then
 this Determination proved, that there was
 another World or State, the immediate Resi-
 dence of *Jehovah*: But this could not concern
 Man, for whose Use it was made and record-
 ed, unless he knew that he had a Soul, and
 that it was designed for this *other*, this *future*
 State. When therefore the Patriarchs de-
 clared themselves *Strangers* and *Pilgrims*
 upon the Earth, and at the same Time knew

that God was in another State; what could they mean but that this was not the Place of Abode, and that they waited for another Country, and that an heavenly. When God inforces all his Laws with the Sanction of *I am Jehovah*, and had shewn by Miracles that he was *Jehovah*; what could this mean, or what could the *Jews* understand by it, but that they were to obey him, and his Laws, for the Sake of that *hereafter*, that *future* State, that *other* System, where was his more immediate Residence and Presence, and where, after this Life ended, they were to live with him for ever? Had the whole *Mosaic* ritual respected God and referred to *God only* as *civil Governor*, that is, Governor of *this* World alone, as Dr. *Warburton* asserts: To what End, permit me to ask, my Lord, were all the Contests about God's Superiority over the created material Agents, the Sun, Moon, and all the Host of Heaven which the Apostate *Jews* and Heathens worshiped? Why was it disputed, or what was it to them, whether *Baal* was God, or *Jehovah* was God? *Baal*, though only God's Creature, gave them Plenty of Victuals and Increase; that was enough for the Body, and they, as supposed, wanted no more, nor looked no further.

St.

St. Paul * tells the *Ephesians*, that, before their Conversion to Christianity, they were "without *Christ*, being *Aliens* from the Commonwealth of *Israel*, and *Strangers* from the Covenants of *Promise*, having no *Hope*, and "without God ^(Abund) in the World." But, according to Dr. *Warburton's* Scheme, this could not be the Case, for since the heathen Nations all around knew, and acted upon the Hope of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, which was made the Sanction of their several Dispensations; how could they have no Hope, and be without God in the World, as the Apostle asserts? How, my Lord, shall we reconcile St. Paul, and Dr. Warburton; and to whom shall we give the Preference? Shall we ingeniously conjecture that the Heathens had the Knowledge of a future State of Rewards, and Punishments; but, notwithstanding had no Hope, and were without God in the World; and that the Jews had Hope, and knew God, but were ignorant of a future State. Will this Salvo do, my Lord? For one does not care, as yet, openly to fly in the Face of an inspired Writer, and, at

the same Time, it is a Pity that the *main Proposition* of so celebrated and admired a Performance, the Labour of so many Years, should be so greatly contradicted, and in Danger of being overthrown by an impertinent Passage of an antiquated Epistle. Be so good, my Lord, as to cast your Eye upon this Passage again. Doth it not seem to say, or to imply, that the *Ephefians* were without *Christ* upon Account of their being *Aliens* from the Commonwealth *(nation)* of *Israel*, and Strangers from the Covenants of Promise; and therefore, or upon that Account, namely, as being *Aliens*, having no *Hope*, and without *God* in the World; and was not *Christ* the End of all the Promises? If so, my Lord, then the *Jews*, being Members of the Commonwealth of *Israel*, must have *Christ*, and consequently the Knowledge of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, which Doctrine must make a Part of their ecclesiastical Policy: For if those who were *Aliens* to that Policy were without *Christ*, those, who were Members of it, must have the Knowledge of *Christ*, and if that Policy taught *Christ*, it must teach the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, because the

Know.

Knowledge of *Christ* and a future State, are inseparably annexed, according to this Gentleman's own Confession.

But permit me, my Lord, to ask what is meant by the Apostle, saying that the *Ephe-
sians* when they were Heathens, had no *Hope*. What was this *Hope* which they had not? Was it the Hope of a future State of Rewards and Punishments? Then Dr. *Warburton* and St. *Paul* are still at Variance: For the Doctor says, that the Heathens had *Hope* of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, and were influenced by it; and the Apostle asserts that they had no *Hope*: So that this Text, at least to me, seems to sit heavy upon Dr. *Warburton's* Medium, which depends as much upon the Heathens having the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments in their Dispensations, as upon the *Jews* not having that Doctrine in the *Mosaic* Dispensation; and yet the Text says, as I think, my Lord, that the Commonwealth of *Israel* did contain in it the Doctrine of *Christ*, and consequently of a future State; and that the Heathens had no *Hope*, were without *Christ*, and without *God in the World*. Doth not,

my Lord, the Knowledge of God imply the Knowledge of a future State? Dr. *Warburton* asserts that it doth not, but says, that the Knowledge of *Satan* doth imply it. And is it not strange that the Knowledge of the Devil should have so close a Connection with a future State, and the Knowledge of God have none? I with this super-ingenuous Writer would oblige the World with the Medium that so closely connects the Knowledge of the Devil and a future State; when the Knowledge of God and those spiritual Beings his holy Angels, has not the least Connection with it. Doth not *St. Paul* * in his Epistle to the *Corinthians* make the saying, there is no Resurrection of the Dead, and the not having the Knowledge of God the same Thing? As the *Jews* then knew God the holy one of *Israel*, they must consequently know there was a Resurrection of the Dead, and so a future State. Doth not the same Apostle †, in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, place the Resurrection of the Dead, and the eternal Judgment among the first Principles or Rudiments of Christianity, and not make them the *Perfection*, as Dr. *Warburton* will have it? And doth

* 1 Cor. xv. ver. 34.

† Ibid. chap. vi. ver. 1, 2.

doth he not tell the *Galatians* that the Law was our School-Master to bring us unto *Christ*? But what Kind of a School-Master was it, or how could it lead to *Christ*, if it did not teach the Elements of *Christianity*? And if it did teach them, it taught a future State. How is *Christ* like unto *Moses*, when *Christ* makes the Doctrine of a future State the Sanction of his Dispensation, and *Moses* omits that Doctrine in his? How could Belief in *Moses's* Writings promote in the *Jews* a Belief in *Christ's* Words, when, according to Dr. *Warburton's* Plan, they are so diametrically opposite? *Moses* in his Writings throwing into a Shade, and with such studious Care keeping out of Sight, and secreting from vulgar Knowledge, every Thing that related to *Christ* and a future State. How can *Christ* be said to bring *Life* and *Immortality* to *Light* in the *Doctor's* Sense, when, according to him, this Doctrine became popular long before *Christ's* coming? Whence came it? Or how got the *Heathens* that Knowledge that was so studiously and industriously kept from the Servants of the true God? But supposing Dr. *Warburton's* Medium to be true, what do *Christians* gain by it? Nothing truly, but

G

what

what no Christian ever yet denied ; and this
 at the Danger of believing what no Christian
 ever yet believed. I will not go further, and
 say, what no one can believe and be a Chri-
 stian, lest you should think this too severe a
 Censure. But consider, my Lord, what
Christ said to the *Jews*, " Do not think that
 " I will accuse you to the Father ; there is
 " one that accuseth you, even *Moses* in whom
 " you trust, for had ye believed *Moses*, ye
 " would have believed me ; for he wrote of
 " me : But if ye believe not *Moses* his Wri-
 " tings, how shall ye believe my Words." Did then *Moses* write of *Christ* by God's In-
 spiration, and yet give the *Jews*, by the same
 God's Direction, a Dispensation designedly
 calculated to omit, and studiously conceal the
 Knowledge of *Christ* from them ? They
 might, upon this Supposition, have answered
Christ, " your Father gave us a Dispensation
 " by this same *Moses* to whose Writings you
 " refer us for Evidence of yourself and your
 " divine Legation ; which Dispensation con-
 " tained in it not the least Intimation, or
 " most distant Hint of you, or of our Belief
 " in you : How then can *Moses* accuse us to
 " the Father, or how can we believe that the
 " *Mosaic* Writings would so flatly contradict
 " the

“ the *Mosaic* Dispensation ; or could those
 “ be designed to declare, what this was
 “ designed to conceal !” Would it not, my
 Lord, be a strange Proposition to advance,
 that the Christian Dispensation contained a
 Doctrine directly contrary to what was taught
 by the Writings of the New Testament ?
 And is not this what Dr. *Warburton* advances
 concerning the *Mosaic* Dispensation ? The
Mosaic Dispensation had nothing in it that
 respected *Christ*, or a future State of Rewards
 and Punishments. The *Mosaic* Writings
 spoke of, and bare Witness to *Christ*, as the
 great Redeemer to come ; and a future State
 and Redemption by *Christ* are inseparably
 annexed, as the Doctor acknowledges : So
 that the one contained what was omitted in
 the other. And yet this Author says, that
 “ a future State of Rewards and Punishments
 “ was revealed under the *Jewish* Dispensa-
 “ tion by those Modes of Information, viz.
 “ Types, which were Signs instead of Words,
 “ which, (as he in the Case of *Abraham* in-
 “ forms us) were of common Practice in those
 “ early Days, and the best Manner Humanity
 “ is capable of receiving Instruction,” So
 then the Doctrine of a future State of Re-

wards and Punishments was *revealed* under the *Jewish* Dispensation, but this same Doctrine is not to be *found in*, nor did make Part of the *Mosaic* Dispensation. Should not Dr. Warburton, my Lord, have told us wherein consisted the Difference between the *Jewish* and *Mosaic* Dispensation; because if the *Jewish* and *Mosaic* are but one and the same Dispensation, then this Concession of his overturns his grand Medium of no future State in the *Mosaic* Dispensation. In one Place of his Work he tells us, that the *Leaders* and *Fathers* of the *Jewish* People had the Knowledge of a future State; and in another Part he cites *David*, *Solomon*, *Isaiah*, *Hezekiah*, *Jeremiah* and *Ezekiel*, as totally ignorant of it, nay brings them as positive Evidences against it. He allows the Law of *Moses* explained by the *Prophets* to teach a future State; though he has subpoenaed the *Prophets* before the Captivity for Witnesses against a future State. But Consistency, my Lord, is not this Gentleman's Talent, and there is so little of it throughout his Works, that one is tempted to think, that in his Haste to be an Author, he has published his *Common-Place Book*: And yet, notwithstanding
all

all this *Farrago*, he has left the divine Legation of *Moses* undemonstrated; his fourth Volume, which was to prove it, being *still-born*. He has another strange Paradox, — that the Doctrine of a future State in *Moses* unavoidably leads to the Denial of the Religion of *Jesus*, because they both contain the same Doctrine." How agreeable this is to what *Moses* says, "a Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your Brethren like unto me." And to what *Christ* that Prophet says, "had ye believed in *Moses*, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me." I leave your Lordship to determine. He adds, "that the *Jews* broached the Error of *Moses* teaching a future State, to countenance and support their Rejection of *Christ*." This towering Genius, that soars so much above System and Connection, may perhaps project a Plan to demonstrate the Necessity of our Redemption from the Denial of the Fall; and gravely assure us that the Notion of the Fall of the *first Adam*, was trumped up by the *Jews* to support their Rejection of Redemption by the *second*.

Is not this, my Lord, the unclean Spirit of Refinement? To what pitiful Shifts is this poor great Man reduced to prop up his Paper-Building? And what an Opinion must this disingenuous Dealing give the World of his Fidelity? How shall we so account of *such an one, as of the Minister of Christ, and Steward of the Mysteries of God, since it is required in Stewards that a Man be found faithful & Faithful*, my Lord, in their Handling of the Word of God, the Scriptures, of which they are Stewards. And I appeal to your Lordship, whether Dr. Warburton's grand Proposition that *the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments is not to be found in, nor did make Part of the Mosaic Dispensation*, notwithstanding he employs every Trick of Prevarication, and handles the Scriptures in a Manner he durst not, for his Ears, in his former Profession have handled any human Record: I ask, notwithstanding all this Chicanery, whether that Proposition doth not flatly contradict the seventh Article of Religion, and the Homily on Faith.

The Age we live in, my Lord, is not distinguished for its Regard to Christianity; and since our Saviour has bid us beware of Wolves in Sheep's Cloathing, it cannot be amiss for Shepherds to have an Eye to their Flocks. And when Mankind are so lukewarm about the Religion they profess, that any Excuse, however trifling, will serve to prevent their searching the Scriptures to see if Things are so; and they see one Clergyman under the Pretence of defending Christianity, (a Word not to be named among Christians) take up an Argument of which the Apostate Jews are ashamed, and maintain it with that Obstinacy, Rancour and Malice, as not to allow his Opponents, even those of his own Cloath, either Learning, Honour or common Sense; one of whom, Mr. *Bate* I mean, has, in my Opinion, proved; (and I must take Leave to say so, till Dr. *Warburton*, or any other disproves it) I say then that Mr. *Bate* has proved the contrary to this Gentleman's Proposition, viz. *that the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments is contained in, and did make the whole of the Mosaic Dispensation, the Mosaic Dispensation*

tion being *Christianity in Hieroglyphics*: And
 it, while this is doing, our *Spiritual Pastors*
 and *Directors*, like *Gallio*, care for none of
these Things, will not the Weak be in
 Danger of falling, the Sceptical and Unbe-
 lieving be hardened in their Doubts and Un-
 belief, and the common Enemy take Advan-
 tage to seek, and represent the whole of
 Christianity as a Cheat, and the Clergy in the
 Secret. And would not the Interposition of
 your Right Reverend Bench, my Lord, (I
 mean to moderate and decide the Question)
 in a great Measure, if not entirely put a stop to
 such extravagant *Novelties*, which are often
 broached, to say no worse, out of Affectation
 and Vanity, to appear wise above what is
 written, and at any Rate to get a Name :
 And would not this be a Means to avoid, for
 the future, the manifold *Enormities* which
 heretofore by false *Doctrines* have crept into
 the Church of God; and prevent our being
 troubled with Words subverting our Souls.

The Weight and general Concern of the
 Matter in Dispute, your Lordship's acknow-
 ledged great Abilities, and extraordinary
 Knowledge in Divinity; of which you have
 given

Given the World such eminent Proof in those
 most excellent Discourses lately published.
 Your Zeal against any Doctrine that carries
 the least Appearance of *Novelty*, and any
 Method of interpreting Scripture that may
 only seem to oppose *Authority* and *Antiquity*;
 (and surely a greater Opposition to, and even
 Insult upon *Authority* and *Antiquity* there
 cannot be, than Dr. Warburton's *Proposition*
of a future State not being contained in the
Mosaic Dispensation.) Your present high Sta-
 tion in the Church, with the Precedent of the
 Apostles and Elders at *Jerusalem* *, who did
 not disdain to listen to the Request of the
 Brethren, but assembled, consulted, and de-
 termined upon a Question of not more Im-
 portance than this. These, my Lord, all
 conspire to justify, nay provoke this Appeal,
 And I hope your Lordship will graciously
 condescend to give your Sentiments of this
 Author's *Medium*, so far as to enable us to
 settle our Belief in this important Affair, which
 cannot fail of highly obliging the World in
 general, and in a particular Manner,

Your Lordship's most obedient,

And most humble Servant,

THE AUTHOR;

♦ Acts xv.

H

E R R A T A.

P Age 38. l. 4. r. commands
 39. l. 12. r. Fathers without the Comma above

on the World such eminent Foot in those
 excellent Discourses lately published.
 but Xel... any Doctrine that comes
 at least Appearance of Mystery, and any
 Method of interpreting Scripture that may
 only seem to oppose Authority and Antiquity;
 and surely a greater Opposition to, and even
 shall upon Authority and Antiquity there
 cannot be, than Dr. Waterhouse's Proposition
 of a future State not being contained in the
 Moral Dispensations. Your present High
 tion in the Church, with the Reverend of the
 Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem, who did
 not decline to listen to the Request of the
 Brethren, but assembled, consulted, and de-
 termined upon a Question of not more in-
 portance than this: These, my Lord, all
 conspire to justify, nay provoke this Appeal.
 And I hope your Lordship will graciously
 condescend to give your Sentiments of this
 Author's Assertion; to far as to enable us to
 settle our Beliefs in that Affair, which
 cannot fail of highly obliging the World in
 general, and in a particular Manner,

9 EE63

Your Lordship's most obedient,
 And most humble Servant,

THE AUTHOR

II

E R R A T A.

1. At the end of the first page, after the word "command",
 2. At the end of the second page, after the word "command",